arXiv:1702.03956v1 [math.LO] 13 Feb 2017

THICKET DENSITY

SIDDHARTH BHASKAR

Abstract. Thicket density is a new measure of the complexity of a set system, having the same relationship to stable formulas that VC density has to NIP formulas. It has a dichotomy analogous to the Sauer-Shelah result that has applications in both model theory (to the Erdős-Hajnal Property for stable graphs) and computability theory (to the separation between recursion and iteration over a particular structure).

§1 Introduction

In the present paper, we introduce a novel combinatorial measure of complexity of a set system, called *thicket density*. We can think about it as an *order* version of Vapnik-Chervonenkis (VC) density;[1] namely, where VC density is a complexity measure for those set systems which do not shatter arbitrarily large sets, thicket density measures those which do not have arbitrarily long ladders. The analogy is quite exact; just as in the VC case, we have thicket dimension and a thicket shatter function that satisfy the Sauer-Shelah dichotomy. This is of particular relevance to model theory, as thicket density has exactly the same relationship to stable first-order theories formulas that VC density has to NIP theories.

In the latter half of this paper, we apply "thicket theory" to simplify two extant results, one from model theory and one from computability theory:

(1) Using our machinery and following Malliaris and Terry [6], we give a very short proof of the Erdős-Hajnal conjecture for families of graphs that exclude half-graphs.
(2) We greatly simplify a combinatorial result of Jerzy Tiuryn [8] in his proof separating recursion from iteration over a general structure.

Finally, we conclude by describing an intriguing analogy between thicket Sauer-Shelah and the perfect set theorem in topology. It is still mostly conjectural, but, we feel, quite compelling, and is the subject of ongoing research.

It is curious that this work was originally inspired by reading Tiuryn's paper, which is as stated a result in dynamic logic, and quite far from model theory proper. We suspect that there is lots of model-theoretic content lurking around in papers about "algorithms over data structures," which is essentially recursion theory over first-order structures.

This line of research began during the my graduate study under the guidance of Yiannis Moschovakis. I wish to thank Matthias Aschenbrenner, Anton Bobkov, Caroline Terry, Larry Moss, and Alex Kruckman for many helpful conversations that often directly contributed to the content of this paper. Thanks again to Larry Moss and Alex Kruckman for helping proofread the original manuscript. Finally, a big thanks to Jerzy Tiuryn, whom I have never met, but whose paper inspired the present results.

[1] See Assouad [1] for an introduction to VC theory.

Organization of this paper In Section 2, we introduce the basic objects of study and prove the thicket version of the Sauer-Shelah dichotomy. We then draw the connection to the order property in Section 3, and describe our two applications in Sections 4 and 5.

§2 Thicket dimension

The fundamental objects in this section are set systems and finite binary trees. A *set system* $(X, \mathcal{F})$ is a set X along with a family $\mathcal{F}$ of subsets of X. When X is implicit, we will sometimes just write a set system as $\mathcal{F}$.

Say that a binary tree is *complete* if each of its vertices has zero or two children. The *depth* of a node in a binary tree is the length of the unique path from the root to that node. A finite binary tree is *balanced* in case each of its leaves (nodes with zero children) have the same depth.

Definition 2.1. Let T be a finite, complete, balanced binary tree and $u, v \in T$ be vertices. We imagine the tree growing downward from the root. Say that

- $T \models u \prec v$ in case v is (strictly) below u
- $T \models u \prec_L v$ if v is below a left child of u, and
- $T \models u \prec_R v$ if v is below a right child of u.

For fixed v, the set of vertices $P(v) = \{u : T \models u \prec v\}$ above v is linearly ordered by $\prec$ and is partitioned by $P_L(v) = \{u : T \models u \prec_L v\}$ and $P_R(v) = \{u : T \models u \prec_R v\}$.

Definition 2.2. Let $(X, \mathcal{F})$ be a set system. A *binary element tree over* $(X, \mathcal{F})$, written $(X, \mathcal{F})$-BET, is a finite, complete, balanced binary tree whose non-leaf vertices are labelled by elements of X. Furthermore,

- we conflate an $(X, \mathcal{F})$-BET T with its underlying tree. For $u \in T$ not a leaf, let $x_u \in X$ be the element labelling it.
- For v a leaf, say that v is *full* in case

$$(\exists F \in \mathcal{F})(\forall u \prec v)(x_u \in F \iff u \prec_L v),$$

  or equivalently,

$$(\exists F \in \mathcal{F})(F \cap P(v) = P_L(v));$$

  otherwise we say v is *empty.*

We distinguish the special case where T has depth 0, i.e., is a single (unlabelled) leaf v. In this case the quantifier $\forall u \prec v$ is vacuous, so the single leaf in T is full iff $\mathcal{F}$ is nonempty.

Definition 2.3. The *thicket dimension*[2] $\dim(X, \mathcal{F})$ is the depth of the deepest $(X, \mathcal{F})$-BET all of whose leaves are full, or ω if there are arbitrarily deep such trees. If there are no such trees, equivalently if $\mathcal{F}$ is empty, the dimension is -1.

Insofar as thicket dimension is essentially a version of Shelah's 2-rank[3] adapted from first-order formulas to set systems, it is not novel. However, the following definitions and the subsequent dichotomy result are.

[2]Thicket dimension was originally called *tree dimension,* but the word "tree" is of course overused tenfold in mathematics. A "thicket" is supposed to suggest a full tree, and hence the deepest such tree would be the "thicket dimension."

[3]See Ch. 9.4 of Hodges [4], who calls it *branching index.*



FIGURE 2.1. A binary element tree over the set system $(\mathbb{N}, \binom{\mathbb{N}}{2})$, where $\binom{\mathbb{N}}{2}$ is the family of all 2-element subsets of $\mathbb{N}$. Filled circles • denote full leaves, and empty ones ∘ denote empty leaves.

Definition 2.4. The *thicket shatter function* $\rho = \rho_{(X,\mathcal{F})}$ is the maximum number of full leaves in any $(X, \mathcal{F})$-BET of depth n. Notice $\rho(n) \leq 2^n$.

As for VC dimension, there is a corresponding dual notion:

Definition 2.5. A *binary decision tree over* $(X, \mathcal{F})$, written $(X, \mathcal{F})$-BDT, is a finite, complete, balanced binary tree whose non-leaf vertices are labelled by elements of $\mathcal{F}$. Similarly,

- we conflate an $\mathcal{F}$-BDT T with its underlying tree. For $u \in T$ not a leaf, let $F_u \in \mathcal{F}$ be the element labelling it.
- A leaf $v \in T$ is *full* in case
$$(\exists x \in X)(\forall u \prec v)(x \in F_u \iff u \prec_L v),$$
otherwise we say v is *empty.*

We distinguish the special case where T has depth 0, i.e. is a single (unlabelled) leaf v. In this case there is no $u \prec v$, so T is full in case X is nonempty.

Definition 2.6. The *dual thicket dimension* $\dim^\star(X, \mathcal{F})$ is the depth of the deepest $(X, \mathcal{F})$-BDT all of whose leaves are full, or ω if there are arbitrarily deep such trees. If there are no such trees, equivalently if X is empty, the dimension is -1.

Definition 2.7. The *dual thicket shatter function* $\rho^\star = \rho^\star_{(X,\mathcal{F})}$ is the maximum number of full leaves in any $\mathcal{F}$-BET of depth n. Notice $\rho^\star(n) \leq 2^n$.

Remark. The *dual set system* $(X, \mathcal{F})^\star$ of $(X, \mathcal{F})$ has domain $\mathcal{F}$ and subsets $\{F \in \mathcal{F} : x \in F\}$ for all $x \in X$. Binary decision trees over $(X, \mathcal{F})$ can be identified with binary element trees over $(X, \mathcal{F})^\star$, and the dual thicket dimension and dual shatter function of $(X, \mathcal{F})$ are simply the thicket dimension and shatter function of $(X, \mathcal{F})^\star$.

Thicket dimension vs. VC dimension Suppose that in the definition of a binary element tree or binary decision tree, we were to stipulate that the labeling must be "constant along rows," i.e., that any two vertices at the same depth must have the same label. Then the resulting notions of dimension, shatter function, dual dimension, and the dual shatter function would be exactly the VC ones–VC dimension, etc. This observation immediately implies that VC dimension is a *lower bound* for thicket dimension, and similarly for each of the other quantities.

For certain set systems, their VC quantities and thicket quantities might agree. For example, take $(\mathbb{N}, \binom{\mathbb{N}}{k})$ is , where $\binom{\mathbb{N}}{k}$ is the family of all k-sized subsets of $\mathbb{N}$. However, our results in Section 3 imply that thicket and VC quantities differ in general. In particular, it can be the case that the VC dimension is finite while the thicket dimension is infinite. Moreover, we suspect that even in the case that both are finite, the VC dimension has no control over the thicket dimension.

The Thicket Sauer-Shelah Dichotomy The statement of the Sauer-Shelah Lemma for the thicket quantities is *exactly the same* as the statement for the corresponding VC quantities. However, the proof is different, and we are not able to derive one as a consequence of the other.

First we state the following easy monotonicity property:

Lemma 2.8. *Suppose $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{G} \subseteq 2^X$. Then the dimension, dual dimension, shatter function, and dual shatter function of the set system $(X, \mathcal{G})$ are each bounded below by their counterpart over $(X, \mathcal{F})$. Similarly for the set system $(Y, \mathcal{F})$, where $X \subseteq Y$.*

Now we state the thicket Sauer-Shelah Lemma itself:

Theorem 2.9. *Let $\varphi(n,k) = \binom{n}{0} + \binom{n}{1} + \cdots + \binom{n}{k}$. For any set system $(X, \mathcal{F})$ and $k < \omega$,*

$$\dim(X, \mathcal{F}) = \omega \implies \forall n \ \rho(n) = 2^n$$
$$\dim(X, \mathcal{F}) \leq k \implies \forall n \ \rho(n) \leq \varphi(n, k).$$

Before we prove Theorem 2.9, we collect the basic underlying combinatorial result into a lemma.

Lemma 2.10. *Suppose T is a complete balanced finite binary tree of depth n. Suppose the vertices of T are labelled by elements of $\mathbb{N} \cup \{-1\}$ such that for any x, y, z such that x labels a parent in T and y and z the left and right children,*

$$\max\{y, z\} \leq x \tag{2.1}$$

$$x \geq 0 \implies \min\{y, z\} < x \tag{2.2}$$

Suppose the root is labelled by a number at most k, where $k \geq 0$. Then the number of nonnegative leaves of T is at most $\varphi(n, k)$.

Proof. The function φ may be defined by the following recurrence:

$$\varphi(n,k) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n = 0 \\ \varphi(n-1, k-1) + \varphi(n-1, k) & \text{if } n > 0 \end{cases}.$$

This recurrence may be verified by looking at Pascal's triangle. Since $\varphi(n,k)$ is the sum of the first k terms from the left of the n-th row of Pascal's triangle, $\varphi(n,k)$ may be obtained by adding the first $k-1$ terms on the row above it twice, plus the k-th term once. This is simply the term $\varphi(n-1, k-1) + \varphi(n-1, k)$.

Using the above recurrence, it's easy to prove this lemma by induction on n. If $n = 0$, then the number of leaves is 1, which is $\varphi(0, k)$. If $n > 0$, then let k_1 and k_2 be the numbers labeling the left and right subtrees of T respectively. Both of these must be at most k, and one of them (let's say k_1 without loss of generality) must be at most $k - 1$. (See Figure 2.2.)



FIGURE 2.2. An integer-labeled tree of depth n

Since the depth of the left and right subtrees is $n-1$, by induction we have that the number of nonnegative leaves of the left subtree is at most $\varphi(n-1,k-1)$, and the number of nonnegative leaves of the right subtree is at most $\varphi(n-1,k)$.

Hence, the number of nonnegative leaves in T is at most their sum, $\varphi(n,k)$, which is what we wanted to show. □

Lemma 2.11. *Consider set systems with domain a fixed set Y. For any $\mathcal{G} \subseteq 2^Y$, if we define*

$$\mathcal{G}_y := \{F \in \mathcal{G} : y \in F\}$$
$$\mathcal{G}_{\bar{y}} := \{F \in \mathcal{G} : y \notin F\},$$

then

$$\max\{\dim(\mathcal{G}_y), \dim(\mathcal{G}_{\bar{y}})\} \leq \dim(\mathcal{G}) \tag{2.3}$$

$$\dim(\mathcal{G}) \geq 0 \implies \min\{\dim(\mathcal{G}_y), \dim(\mathcal{G}_{\bar{y}})\} < \dim(\mathcal{G}) \tag{2.4}$$

Proof. Equation (2.3) follows from monotonicity of dimension (Lemma 2.8). Equation (2.4) is implied by (2.3) in case the dimensions of $\mathcal{G}_y$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{y}}$ are different, so suppose that

$$\dim(\mathcal{G}_y) = \dim(\mathcal{G}_{\bar{y}}) = d.$$

Since $\dim(\mathcal{G}) \geq 0$, $\mathcal{G}$ is nonempty. Hence one of $\mathcal{G}_y$ and $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{y}}$ are nonempty, and hence $d > 0$. In this case we have a full $\mathcal{G}_y$-BET T_1 and a full $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{y}}$-BET T_2 each of depth d. The tree T with root y, left subtree is T_1, and right subtree is T_2 is a full $\mathcal{G}$-BET of depth $d+1$. Hence $d+1 \leq \dim(\mathcal{G})$. □

Finally, we can prove Theorem 2.9.

Proof. Let X be implicit so that we write, e.g., $\dim(\mathcal{F})$ instead of $\dim(X,\mathcal{F})$.

Clearly, if $\dim(\mathcal{F}) = \omega$, there are arbitrarily deep full $\mathcal{F}$-BET's, so $\rho(n) = 2^n$.

On the other hand, suppose $\dim(\mathcal{F}) \leq k$ and consider an $\mathcal{F}$-BET T of depth n. For $u \in T$ not a leaf, let $x_u \in X$ be the element labelling u. For all $v \in T$, we associate a family $\mathcal{F}_v$ of subsets of X as follows:

- If v is the root, $\mathcal{F}_v$ is $\mathcal{F}$.
- If v is not a root, let p be the parent of v and let x be x_p. If u is a left child of p, then $\mathcal{F}_v = (\mathcal{F}_p)_x$. Otherwise, $\mathcal{F}_v = (\mathcal{F}_p)_{\bar{x}}$.

In other words, $\mathcal{F}_v$ is exactly those elements of $\mathcal{F}$ which contain u such that $u \prec_L v$ and exclude u such that $u \prec_R v$. It is easy to see that a leaf v is full exactly when $\mathcal{F}_v$ is nonempty.

Finally, label each node v of T by $\dim(\mathcal{F}_v)$ to obtain a tree labeled by integers. (See Figure 2.3)



FIGURE 2.3. A binary element tree and its corresponding integer-labeled tree. Full leaves on the left correspond to nonnegative leaves on the right.

By Lemma 2.11, these numbers satisfy the hypotheses of Lemma 2.10, so at most $\varphi(n,k)$ leaves of T are labelled by nonnegative integers. But a leaf v is labelled by a nonnegative integer exactly when $\dim(\mathcal{F}_v) \geq 0$, exactly when $\mathcal{F}_v$ is nonempty, exactly when v is full. Since $\rho(n)$ counts the maximum number of full leaves in a tree of depth n, we have that

$$\rho(n) \leq \varphi(n,k),$$

which is what we wanted to show. □

Thicket Density Lemma 2.10 allows us to define density:

Definition 2.12. The *thicket density* $\operatorname{dens}(X,\mathcal{F})$ is defined to be

$$\inf\{c : \rho_{(X,\mathcal{F})} \in O(n^c)\},$$

or ω in case $\dim(X,\mathcal{F})$ is ω. The *dual thicket density* is similar but with $\rho^\star_{(X,\mathcal{F})}$ in place of $\rho_{(X,\mathcal{F})}$.

Thicket density clearly satisfies the same monotonicity properties as the other quantities as stated in Lemma 2.8. Moreover, as $\rho_{(X,\mathcal{F})} \in O(n^k)$ where $k = \dim(X,\mathcal{F})$, we can see that $\operatorname{dens}(X,\mathcal{F}) \leq \dim(X,\mathcal{F})$.

Thicket density behaves very similarly to VC density in a number of ways. For example, the thicket density of $(X,\mathcal{F})$ is less than 1 iff it's equal to 0 iff $\mathcal{F}$ is finite. (This result follows from the observation that given an infinite family $\mathcal{F}$ and any $x \in X$, either $\mathcal{F}_x$ or $\mathcal{F}_{\bar{x}}$ must be infinite.)

Assouad [1] proves several identities that describe how VC density behaves with respect to operations on set systems. For example, if we have two set systems $(X,\mathcal{F})$ and $(X,\mathcal{G})$ then the VC density of their "union" $(X,\mathcal{F}\cup\mathcal{G})$ is equal to the maximum of the VC densities of the components. This identity still holds in the thicket case, since the shatter function of the union is bounded below by the shatter function of each of the components, but bounded above by their sum.

On the other hand, given two set systems $(X,\mathcal{F})$ and $(Y,\mathcal{G})$, the VC density of their "cartesian product"

$$(X\times Y, \{F\times G : F\in\mathcal{F},\ G\in\mathcal{G}\})$$

is bounded by the sum of the VC densities of the components. We suspect this remains true for thicket densities, but have not been able to prove it yet.

In our opinion, the most fundamental question about thicket density is what values it can take. The question of whether it can assume non-integer values remains wide open. However, in Section 6 we conjecture the existence of a *derivative*

operation on set systems which decrements the density by exactly one. This would have the striking consequence that thicket density is integer valued, as we know it can't take values in $(0, 1)$. If true, this would be a significant difference from VC density, which ranges over all of $[1, \infty)$.

§3 Thicket Dimension and Order

Two fundamental properties of first-order structures introduced by Saharon Shelah in his classification program are *stability* and the *independence property*. Fix a signature Φ, a partitioned Φ-formula $\varphi(x; y)$, and a Φ-theory T.[4] Then we have:

Definition 3.1. φ is *unstable* (or, *has the order property*) for a Φ-structure $\mathbf{M}$ in case for every $t \in \mathbb{N}$ there are $a_1, \ldots, a_t \in M^{|x|}$ and $b_1, \ldots, b_t \in M^{|y|}$ such that

$$\mathbf{M} \models \varphi(a_i; b_j) \iff i \leq j$$

for all $1 \leq i, j \leq t$. φ is unstable for T in case it is unstable for some (equivalently, any) $\mathbf{M} \models T$.

Definition 3.2. φ has the *independence property* for $\mathbf{M}$ in case for every $t \in \mathbb{N}$ there are $b_1, \ldots, b_t \in M^{|x|}$ and for every $S \subseteq \{1, \ldots, t\}$ there is $a_S \in M^{|y|}$ such that

$$\mathbf{M} \models \varphi(a_S; b_j) \iff j \in S$$

for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, t\}$. φ is has the independence property for T in case it is has the independence property for some (equivalently, any) $\mathbf{M} \models T$.

Define the set system

$$S_\varphi(\mathbf{M}) = (M^{|x|}, \{\varphi(M^{|x|}; b) : b \in M^{|y|}\})$$

It is well known that φ has the independence property for $\mathbf{M}$ iff $S_\varphi(\mathbf{M})$ has infinite VC dimension.

Stability theory tells us that a partitioned first-order formula has the order property iff its 2-rank is infinite. Thicket dimension is a combinatorial version of Shelah's 2-rank and we can easily formulate the order property purely in terms of set systems. Therefore, it is no surprise that infinite thicket dimension captures the order property for set systems, and that the proof is essentially identical to the one for formulas.

In particular, this shows that thicket dimension has exactly the same relationship to stability that VC dimension has to dependence; namely that a formula $\varphi(x; y)$ is stable relative to a theory T iff the set system $S_\varphi(\mathbf{M})$ has infinite thicket dimension.

The familiar passage between *ladders* (orders) and trees has the consequence that thicket dimension is finite iff the dual dimension is finite. Unlike in the VC case, where the two dimensions can differ by at most a single exponent, and this is known to be tight, here we show that they differ by at most a double exponent, and we do not know if this is tight.

In the present section, we merely state the definitions and theorems relevant to the passage between ladders and trees without proving the hard part (Theorem 3.7), which can be found in Lemma 9.4.10 of Hodges [4].

[4] As is common in model theory, we regard x and y as *tuples* of variables, and $|x|$ and $|y|$ as their lengths.

Definition 3.3. An *k-ladder* is a sequence $(x_1, F_1, x_2, F_2, \ldots, x_k, F_k)$ such that for any distinct i and j, $x_i \in F_j \iff i < j$. We say a k-ladder is *strict* if in addition $x_i \notin F_i$.

Lemma 3.4. *If $(X, \mathcal{F})$ has a $2k$-ladder, then it has a strict k-ladder.*

Proof. If $(x_1, F_1, \ldots, x_{2k}, F_{2k})$ is a ladder, then $(x_2, F_1, x_4, F_3, \ldots, x_{2k}, F_{2k-1})$ is a strict ladder. □

Definition 3.5. The *ladder dimension* of a set system $(X, \mathcal{F})$ is the length of its largest ladder, or ω if there are arbitrarily long ladders. The set system $(X, \mathcal{F})$ satisfies the *order property* in case its ladder dimension is ω.

Theorem 3.6. *If $(X, \mathcal{F})$ has a strict 2^k-ladder, its thicket dimension is at least k.*

Proof. The following picture should make it clear. Each F_i is a witness to the fullness of the leaf it labels. □



Theorem 3.7. *If the thicket dimension of a set system is at least $2^k - 1$, it has a k-ladder.*

(This is the hard part, whose proof we omit.)

Corollary 3.8. *If the thicket dimension of a set system is k, its dual thicket dimension is at most $2^{2^{k+2}} - 2$.*

Proof. We prove the contrapositive. Suppose

$$\dim^\star(X, \mathcal{F}) = \dim(X, \mathcal{F})^\star \geq 2^{2^{k+2}} - 1.$$

Then by Theorem 3.7, $(X, \mathcal{F})^\star$ has a ladder of length 2^{k+2}, and hence a strict ladder of length 2^{k+1}. Since ladders (and strict ladders) are self-dual, $(X, \mathcal{F})$ has a ladder of length 2^{k+1}. Therefore, by Theorem 3.6, $\dim(X, \mathcal{F}) \geq k + 1$. □

Corollary 3.9. *The thicket dimension of $(X, \mathcal{F})$ is finite iff $(X, \mathcal{F})$ fails the order property.*

Proof. Immediate by Theorems 3.6 and 3.7. □

Corollary 3.9 shows that $\varphi(x; y)$ is stable relative to $\mathbf{M}$ exactly when $S_\varphi(\mathbf{M})$ has finite thicket dimension, as $\varphi(x; y)$ is stable as a formula when $S_\varphi(\mathbf{M})$ fails the order property as a set system.

Notice that this gives us a slew of examples of set systems in which the thicket density is infinite but the VC density is finite:

- The set system $S_\varphi(\mathbf{M})$ for any unstable, dependent formula φ, for example when $\mathbf{M}$ is an infinite order and $\varphi(x, y)$ is $x < y$.
- The family of all *half-spaces* in $\mathbb{R}^n$.
- $(X, \mathcal{F})$ where $X = \mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathcal{F}$ is the family of subsets $2^n 3^m \mathbb{Z}$ for all n and m.

§4 Application: The Stable Erdős-Hajnal Conjecture

Remark. Throughout this section, we identify any graph (V, E) with the set system $(V, \mathcal{N})$, where $\mathcal{N}$ is the family of *neighbor sets,* i.e.,

$$\mathcal{N} = \{\Gamma_v : v \in V\},$$

$\Gamma_v \subseteq V$ being the set of neighbors of v. (Set systems obtained by graphs in this way are not completely general; they are self-dual under the map $v \mapsto \Gamma_v$.)

We say that a family of finite graphs $\mathfrak{G}$ has the *Erdős-Hajnal property* if there exists δ such that for each $G \in \mathfrak{G}$ of size n, G has either a complete or independent set of size $\Omega(n^\delta)$. The *Erdős-Hajnal conjecture* states that for each finite graph H, the family of graphs that omit H as a subgraph (or "H-free graphs") has the Erdős-Hajnal property. The conjecture is known to be true for many specific H, but remains open in general.

The *half-graph* H_k of length k is the bipartite graph with vertex set $\{a_n, b_n\}_{n\leq k}$ of distinct elements and edges between a_i and b_j just in case $i < j$. In this section, we prove the Erdős-Hajnal conjecture when $H = H_k$ for any k. To show that a family $\mathfrak{G}$ has the Erdős-Hajnal property, it suffices to show that a super-family $\mathfrak{G}^\star \supseteq \mathfrak{G}$ does. To that end, we will show that for each k, the family of H_k-free graphs has bounded thicket dimension, and show that any family of graphs with bounded thicket dimension has the Erdős-Hajnal property.

We deal with the former statement first. Put contrapositively, it becomes:

$$\forall k\, \exists \ell\ \dim(V, \mathcal{N}) \geq \ell \implies (V, \mathcal{N}) \text{ contains } H_k, \tag{4.1}$$

and is implied by the following two assertions:

$$\forall k\, \exists \ell\ \dim(V, \mathcal{N}) \geq \ell \implies (V, \mathcal{N}) \text{ has a strict } k\text{-ladder}, \tag{4.2}$$

$$\forall k\, \exists \ell\ \dim(V, \mathcal{N}) \text{ has a strict } \ell\text{-ladder} \implies (V, \mathcal{N}) \text{ contains } H_k. \tag{4.3}$$

Implication 4.2 is an immediate consequence of Theorem 3.7 and Lemma 3.4. Since ladders and half-graphs are so similar, it seems as if having a k-ladder should be equivalent to containing H_k as a subgraph, thus verifying implication 4.3. Specifically, if $(V, \mathcal{N})$ has the strict k-ladder

$$(u_1, \Gamma_{v_1}, \ldots, u_k, \Gamma_{v_k}),$$

it seems as if $\{u_n, v_n\}_{n\leq k}$ should be the vertices of a bipartite graph, as

$$u_i E v_j \iff u_i \in \Gamma_{v_j} \iff i < j.$$

The problem is that in the original ladder, the u_i's and v_j's are not required to be distinct, whereas in the bipartite graph they are. Thus we have counterexamples like the following:

FIGURE 4.1. A graph with a 3-ladder but no H_3-subgraph.

On the other hand, if $u_i \neq v_j$ for each i and j, then $\{u_n, v_n\}_{n \leq k}$ does indeed form a half graph. Therefore, it remains to show:

Lemma 4.1. *For all k there exists an ℓ such that if $\dim(V, \mathcal{N})$ has a strict ℓ-ladder, then $(V, \mathcal{N})$ has a strict k-ladder with distinct vertices.*

Proof. (Sketch) Fix k and let $\ell = 1 + 2 + 2 + 3 + 3 + \cdots + k + k$. Suppose we have a strict ladder $(u_1, \Gamma_{v_1}, \ldots, u_\ell, \Gamma_{v_\ell})$. We extract a sub-ladder $(a_1, \Gamma_{b_1}, \ldots, a_k, \Gamma_{b_k})$ as follows. Let $a_1 = u_1$. One of $\{v_2, v_3\}$ must be different from a_1, let b_1 be that. One of $\{u_4, u_5\}$ must be different from b_1, let a_2 be that. One of $\{v_6, v_7, v_8\}$ must be different from both a_1 and a_2, let b_2 be that. And so on. □

Having verified that families of graphs omitting some H_k have bounded thicket dimension, it remains to prove the Erdős-Hajnal property for families of graphs with bounded thicket dimension. Our proof follows (and significantly simplifies) Section 4 of Malliaris and Terry [6], which itself is based on Section 3 of Malliaris and Shelah's paper [5] on stable regularity.

Fir Trees We define another kind of tree over a given set system, called a *fir tree.*[5] This is basically a binary element tree with the following modifications:

- They are no longer required to be complete or balanced. (In other words, the underlying tree is an arbitrary rooted binary tree. However, even when a vertex has only one child, that child must either be a left child or right child.)
- The labeling of nodes by numbers described in the proof of Theorem 2.9 on page 5 is required to be nonnegative for each node. Equivalently, for each leaf ℓ in the tree, there is at least one set in $\mathcal{F}$ which contains $\{x_v : T \models v \prec_L \ell\}$ and is disjoint from $\{x_v : T \models v \prec_R \ell\}$.

The point is, fir trees in a set system of finite dimension are always "tall and thin:"

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\dim(X, \mathcal{F}) \leq k$. Let $\sigma(n)$ be the minimum depth of any fir tree over $(X, \mathcal{F})$ of size n. Then $\sigma(n) \geq n^{1/(k+1)} - 2$.*

Proof. Let ρ be the shatter function for $(X, \mathcal{F})$. By the dichotomy theorem (Theorem 2.9),

$$\rho(d) \leq \binom{d}{0} + \binom{d}{1} + \cdots + \binom{d}{k}$$

for all d. Since $\binom{d}{j} \leq d^j$ for each d and j, $\rho(d)$ is bounded by $\sum_{j \leq k} d^j$, which is itself bounded by $(d+1)^k$. Therefore, for any d and Δ,

$$\sum_{d \leq \Delta} \rho(d) \leq \sum_{d \leq \Delta} (d+1)^k,$$

and, using a very rough estimate for the latter term,

$$\sum_{d \leq \Delta} \rho(d) \leq (\Delta + 2)^{k+1}.$$

Now fix a fir tree T of size n, and let Δ be its depth. For $d \leq \Delta$, the number of leaves in T at depth d is clearly bounded by $\rho(d)$. Therefore,

$$n \leq \sum_{d \leq \Delta} \rho(d),$$

[5]Because fir trees are "tall and thin." I'm open to better suggestions.

and hence

$$n \leq (\Delta + 2)^{k+1}.$$

Solving for Δ, we find

$$n^{1/(k+1)} - 2 \leq \Delta.$$

Since this holds for an arbitrary fir tree of size n, and $\sigma(n)$ is the minimum value of Δ as T ranges over all such fir trees, we have that

$$n^{1/(k+1)} - 2 \leq \sigma(n).$$

□

Constrast this result to an infinite dimensional set system, where $\sigma(n) = \log_2(n)$. (Indeed, the fact that $\sigma(n) = \log_2(n)$ or grows like $\Omega(n^\delta)$ for some δ is essentially a restatement of thicket Sauer-Shelah.)

Type trees and the Erdős-Hajnal Property

Definition 4.3. Consider a graph $(V, \mathcal{N})$. For any nonempty subset $S \subseteq V$, we define a labelled binary tree $\Theta(S)$ by (non-deterministic) recursion:

- Label the root of $\Theta(S)$ by any $s \in S$, and let $S' = S \setminus \{s\}$.
- Let the left subtree of $\Theta(S)$ be $\Theta(S' \cap \Gamma_s)$ (unless $S' \cap \Gamma_s$ is empty, in which case there is no left subtree).
- Similarly, let the right subtree of $\Theta(S)$ be $\Theta(S' \setminus \Gamma_s)$.

This procedure is called, in the language of [6], *arranging S into a type tree*. It's not hard to see that each element of S labels exactly one vertex of $\Theta(S)$. Moreover, let $\prec$ be the partial order on S induced by $\Theta(S)$, and partition it into relations $\prec_L$ and $\prec_R$ as in Definition 2.1. Then

$$\Theta(S) \models s \prec_L t \implies t \in \Gamma_s \ (\iff s \in \Gamma_t)$$

and

$$\Theta(S) \models s \prec_R t \implies t \notin \Gamma_s \ (\iff s \notin \Gamma_t).$$

This shows that $\Theta(S)$ is a fir tree. Namely, if t labels a leaf, then Γ_t contains all s such that $s \prec_L t$ and excludes all s such that $s \prec_R t$.

The crucial lemma about type trees is that each path is the disjoint union of a clique and an independent set from the original graph:

Lemma 4.4. *Let P be a path in $\Theta(S)$, and let b be below all elements of P. Let $Q = \{p \in P : p \prec_L b\}$ and $R = \{p \in P : p \prec_R b\}$. Then $P = Q \sqcup R$, Q is a clique, and R is an independent set.*

Proof. For any $r \prec s \prec t$ in S, $r \prec_L s \iff r \prec_L t$. In other words, $s \in \Gamma_r \iff t \in \Gamma_r$.

Pick q_1 and q_2 in Q. Without loss of generality, assume $q_1 \prec q_2 \prec b$. By assumption, $q_1 \prec_L b$, so by the above observation, $q_1 \prec_L q_2$, so that $q_2 \in \Gamma_{q_1}$, and q_1 and q_2 are connected by an edge in the original graph.

Similarly, for any $r_1 \prec r_2$ in R, $r_1 \prec_R r_2$, so that r_1 and r_2 have no edge between them. □

Therefore *long branches in type trees* yield *large complete or independent sets*. On the other hand, if $\dim(V, \mathcal{N}) \leq k$, Lemma 4.2 implies that $\Theta(V)$, being a fir tree, has depth at least $|V|^{1/(k+1)} - 2$, so there must be either a complete or independent set of size at least half that! This allows us to conclude

Theorem 4.5. *Families of graphs with bounded thicket dimension satisfy the Erdős-Hajnal Property. Specifically, if we consider the family of all graphs $(V, \mathcal{N})$ of thicket dimension at most k, it satisfies the Erdős-Hajnal Property with $\delta = \frac{1}{k+1}$.*

§5 Application: Tiuryn's Separation

There is a long tradition of extending computability from the natural numbers to general first-order structures. The works of Moschovakis, Greibach, Friedman, and Tucker and Zucker ([7, 3, 2, 9] respectively) form a good sample of the variety of approaches.

General models of deterministic, sequential computation may typically be classified as either *recursive* or *iterative*. Roughly speaking, a program is "recursive" if can express general recursive definitions, and "iterative" if it cannot express recursion more complicated than while loops. Over the natural numbers, recursive and iterative programs coincide extensionally, and for a while it was not known whether this was true in general. Jerzy Tiuryn's paper [8] gives a negative example in which the two classes differ. While not the first, it is a particularly simple example where the classes are separated by a particularly simple query, which we now describe.

Let the structure $\mathbf{T}_n$ have as its domain T_n, the finite, complete, balanced binary tree of depth n. Augment T_n with equality $=$ and the unary functions s and d (for *son* and *daughter*), which fix leaves and return the left and right child on other nodes.

Consider the program

$$\mathtt{p}(\mathtt{x},\mathtt{y}) = \begin{cases} \mathtt{x} = \mathtt{y} & \text{if } \mathtt{x} = s(\mathtt{x}) \\ \mathtt{p}(s(\mathtt{x}),\mathtt{y}) \vee \mathtt{p}(d(\mathtt{x}),\mathtt{y}) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This program, when applied to *any* tree $\mathbf{T}_n$, computes the relation "y lies in the subtree below x." Therefore, we say that relation is uniformly recursive. On the other hand, Tiuryn showed that this relation is not uniformly *iterative*, i.e. not computable over each $\mathbf{T}_n$ by a single iterative program.[6]

It turns out that the main intermediate result in Tiuryn's paper is a consequence of a certain set system arising from $\mathbf{T}_n$ having finite thicket density. That result is what we will present in this section; however, first we shall attempt to describe why thicket density should have anything to do with computability.

Computation and decision trees It is well known in the theory of algorithms that one can "unwind" any deterministic, sequential program into a decision tree, which encodes all the possible sequence of choices the program can make at its conditional or branching steps. In fact, if we cut off the tree at some depth, we get exactly a binary decision tree in our sense. The associated set system has domain the set of possible inputs and family of sets given by the all the different possible queries we can make of the input. (Most models of general computation allow atomic tests of their variables.)

The so-called "decision-tree model" is useful for proving several algorithmic lower bounds, most famously the $\Omega(n \log n)$ lower bound on the number of comparsions required to sort a list of n atoms from an ordered set. The basic argument goes like this: you select some collection of N inputs, each of which must take a different

[6] In actuality, Tiuryn was interested in a separation between iteration and nondeterministic iteration, rather than a separation between iteration and general recursion.

path through the tree. Since the tree is binary, one such path must have depth at least $\log_2 N$. The depth in the tree is a lower bound for the time complexity of the original program.

Suppose, however, we knew that the set system in question had finite thicket dimension. Then given a collection of N distinct paths through a decision tree, one of them must have depth at least $N^{1/k}$, which is a much stronger lower bound than $\Omega(\log N)$.

Tiuryn's main lemma is exactly the conclusion of thicket Sauer-Shelah for a certain set system. In his terminology, it becomes "the number of shapes of computation fragments of length t grows polynomially in t." Tiuryn leverages this lemma to get a lower bound in a somewhat more sophisticated way than the argument we sketched above, providing another example of how to extract strong lower bounds from decision trees of finite density.

In the remainder of this section, we isolate the model-theoretic content of this result by defining the relevant set system and showing that it has finite thicket dimension.

The technical content behind Tiuryn's main lemma The *height* of an element of T_n is its distance from the leaf level. A term in this signature has the form $\alpha(\mathtt{x})$, where $\mathtt{x}$ is a variable and α is a string of s's and d's. It is easy to see that quantifier-free 1-types in $\mathbf{T}_n$ are parameterized by the heights: there is exactly 1-type for each height $\leq n$. Each of these types is principal, the type of height h being captured by the formulas $s^{h-1}(\mathtt{x}) \neq s^h(\mathtt{x})$ and $s^h(\mathtt{x}) = s^{h+1}(\mathtt{x})$.

What are the possible quantifier-free 2-types that a pair of elements (x, y) in $\mathbf{T}_n$ can satisfy? It is useful to parameterize the 2-types by the 1-types of x and y, so suppose that the height of x is h_1, the height of y is h_2, and (without loss of generality) that $h_1 \geq h_2$. Then it is not hard to see that there are $2^{h_1-h_2}+1$ possible quantifier-free 2-types: for each $\alpha \in \{s, d\}^{h_1-h_2}$, a type for all (x, y) such that $\alpha(x) = y$, and a single type encompassing all pairs (x, y) where y is not below x.

Moreover, the following fact is easy to prove:

Lemma 5.1. *Let $p(\mathtt{x}, \mathtt{y})$ and $q(\mathtt{x}, \mathtt{y})$ be two distinct quantifier-free 2-types, such that the 1-type of $\mathtt{x}$ in p agrees with the 1-type of $\mathtt{x}$ in q, and the 1-type of $\mathtt{y}$ in p agrees with the 1-type of $\mathtt{y}$ in q. Then p and q do not contain any common atomic formula in which both $\mathtt{x}$ and $\mathtt{y}$ occur.*

That is to say, there is no formula of the form $\beta_1(\mathtt{x}) = \beta_2(\mathtt{y})$ which is satisfied by two pairs (x, y) and (x', y') with identical heights but of different quantifier-free 2-type.

A *full extended atomic formula* $A(\mathtt{x}_1, \ldots, \mathtt{x}_k)$ is an atomic formula A with a variable context $(\mathtt{x}_1, \ldots, \mathtt{x}_k)$, such that all of the variables occuring in A appear in the tuple $(\mathtt{x}_1, \ldots, \mathtt{x}_k)$.[7] For a full extended formula $A(\mathtt{x}_1, \ldots, \mathtt{x}_k)$ and a tuple $(x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ of elements from some $\mathbf{T}_n$, we say

$$\mathbf{T}_n \models A(x_1, \ldots, x_k)$$

to mean the obvious thing.

[7]The terminology "full extended formula" is due to Moschovakis. In this signature, at most two variables can actually occur in any atomic formula.

We now will define a set system $(T^{\bar{h}}, \mathcal{A}_n^{\bar{h}})$ for any n and any tuple $\bar{h}$ of natural numbers. Recall that given a set system $(X, \mathcal{F})$ and an arbitrary subset $Y \subseteq X$, we can form the *restriction* $(Y, \mathcal{F} \restriction Y)$ by intersecting all the members of $\mathcal{F}$ with Y.

Definition 5.2. Fix n and k, and let $\bar{\mathtt{x}} = (\mathtt{x}_1, \ldots, \mathtt{x}_k)$. For every full extended atomic formula $A(\bar{\mathtt{x}})$, let $A(T_n^k)$ be the set $\{\bar{x} \in (T_n)^k : \mathbf{T}_n \models A(\bar{x})\}$, i.e. the solution set of A in T_n. Let $\mathcal{A}_n^k$ be the collection of $A(T_n^k)$ for each full extended atomic formula $A(\bar{\mathtt{x}})$.

Definition 5.3. For any $\bar{h} \in \mathbb{N}^k$, let $T_n^{\bar{h}} \subseteq T_n^k$ be those tuples $\bar{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_k)$ such that the height of x_i is h_i for $1 \leq i \leq k$. Let $(T_n^{\bar{h}}, \mathcal{A}_n^{\bar{h}})$ be the set system obtained by restricting $(T_n^k, \mathcal{A}_n^k)$ to $T_n^{\bar{h}}$.

This is in fact the set system Tiuryn cares about, and whose finite density entails his subsequent separation results.

Lemma 5.4. *For any $\bar{h}$, $\dim^\star(T_n^{\bar{h}}, \mathcal{A}_n^{\bar{h}})$ is finite, in particular at most $\binom{k}{2}+1$ where $k = |\bar{h}|$.*

Proof. Consider a binary decision tree in this set system of depth $\binom{k}{2} + 2$. We will show that not all the leaves in this BDT can be full.

Consider $\binom{k}{2} + 1$ atomic formulas that define sets on the leftmost branch of this BDT. Each of these atomic formulas has the form

$$\alpha(\mathtt{x}_i) = \beta(\mathtt{x}_j)$$

for some $i, j \leq k$ and sequences α and β of s's and d's.

Suppose that for some formula $i = j$, i.e., it has the form $\alpha(\mathtt{x}_i) = \beta(\mathtt{x}_i)$ for some i. Since the heights of elements in $T_n^{\bar{h}}$ are fixed, their 1-types are determined. Hence, either every tuple in $T_n^{\bar{h}}$ satisfies $\alpha(\mathtt{x}_i) = \beta(\mathtt{x}_i)$ or none do. In either case, not all the leaves in this binary decision tree can be full, since this formula does not nontrivially split the domain.

Now suppose that each atomic formula defining sets on the leftmost branch contains two distinct variables. Since there are $\binom{k}{2} + 1$ such formulas, there must be two full extended atomic formulas $A(\bar{\mathtt{x}})$ and $B(\bar{\mathtt{x}})$ in which exactly the same pair $\{\mathtt{x}_i, \mathtt{x}_j\}$ of distinct variables occur. Suppose that $A(\bar{\mathtt{x}})$ comes above $B(\bar{\mathtt{x}})$ in this leftmost branch. Then any tuple $\bar{x}$ that "arrives at" $B(\bar{\mathtt{x}})$ must have satisfied $A(\bar{\mathtt{x}})$, and thus by Lemma 5.1, the quantifier-free 2-type of $\{\mathtt{x}_i, \mathtt{x}_j\}$ must be determined. In particular, it is determined whether or not $\bar{x}$ satisfies $B(\bar{\mathtt{x}})$, and so the tree in question cannot be full. □

§6 Conclusion: the Topological Connection

We hope we have shown that thicket theory is an elegant new idea with significant explanatory power. For better and for worse, a great deal of relevant work remains stubbornly in the future. In particular, let us mention:

- sussing out the mysterious connection with VC density and the (original) Sauer-Shelah dichotomy,
- proving several combinatorial identities of density and dimension, *à la* Assouad [1],

- situating thicket density for first-order formulas among the various model-theoretic notions of rank, dimension, density, etc., and
- finding more connections to algorithmic lower bound.

However, let us finish by describing one last, and most intriguing question:

Let T be a theory, $\mathbf{M} \models T$ be a monster model, and $S^\varphi(\mathbf{M})$ be the set of complete φ-types over $\mathbf{M}$. This forms a topological space, in fact a Polish space. The *perfect set theorem* tells us that Polish spaces are either countable or at least continuum-sized, and in the case of $S^\varphi(\mathbf{M})$, these cases are distinguished by whether or not φ satisfies the order property.

Now, consider the set system $S_\varphi(\mathbf{M})$. Thicket Sauer-Shelah tells us that the shatter function of this set system grows either polynomially or exponentially, and the two cases are again distinguished by whether or not φ satisfies the order property.

This suggests (and we conjecture) an analogy between topological spaces and set systems under which,

- $S^\varphi(\mathbf{M})$ corresponds to $S_\varphi(\mathbf{M})$,
- the perfect set theorem corresponds to thicket Sauer-Shelah,
- Cantor-Bendixson rank corresponds to thicket dimension or density,
- and that there is a *derivative* operator on set systems that corresponds to the Cantor derivative.

The prospect of this last point we find especially intriguing. We feel that this "set system derivative" should decrement the dimension and the density by 1, and that it should roughly induce the *discrete derivative*

$$f \mapsto \lambda n.(f(n+1) - f(n))$$

on shatter functions.

Notice that the Sauer-Shelah lemma states that shatter functions are either equal to 2^n or bounded by $\sum_{i=0}^{k} \binom{n}{i}$ for some k. But these functions are exactly the discrete analogues of the functions e^x and $\sum_{i<k} \frac{x^i}{i!}$, as 2^n is fixed by the discrete derivative operator, and the analogue of the polynomial x^i is

$$n^{\bar{i}} = i! \binom{n}{i}$$

whose discrete derivative is

$$i \cdot n^{\bar{i-1}}.$$

So, if this hypothetical set system derivative were to induct the discrete derivative on the shatter function, then the derivative of an infinite-dimensional set system would be infinite dimensional, as its shatter function would be fixed by the discrete derivative. Similarly, the density of the derivative of a set system would be one less than the original, as the discrete derivative would decrement the degree of the shatter function by one.

We find this very compelling, but it remains to find the correct definition of "derivative of a set system!"

References

[1] Patrick Assouad. Densite et dimension. *Annales de l'Institut Fourier*, 33(3):233–282, 1983.

[2] Friedman and Mansfield. Algorithmic procedures. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Soceity*, 332:297–312, 1992.

[3] Sheila A. Greibach. *Theory of Program Structures: Schemes, Semantics, Verification*. Springer-Verlag, 1975.
[4] Wilfrid Hodges. *A Shorter Model Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.
[5] M. Malliaris and S. Shelah. Regularity lemmas for stable graphs. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 366:1551–1585, 2014.
[6] Maryanthe Malliaris and Caroline Terry. On unavoidable induced subgraphs in large prime graphs. arXiv:1511.02544.
[7] Y. N. Moschovakis. Abstract recursion and intrinsic complexity. Lecture Notes in Logic (Forthcoming), 2015.
[8] Jerzy Tiuryn. A simplified proof of ddl $<$ dl. *Information and Computation*, 81(1):1–12, 1989.
[9] J. V. Tucker and J. I. Zucker. *Computable functions and semicomputable sets on many-sorted algebras*, chapter 5, pages 397–525. Oxford University Press, 2000.

Mathematics Department, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405